

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5-8 and 15-33 are currently active in this case. Claims 1, 5, 15 and 16 have been amended, Claims 2-4, 9-14, and 18 have been canceled, and Claims 23-33 have been added by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 9 and 13 were objected to based on informalities; Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-16 and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bush* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,754,664, hereinafter *Bush*); and Claims 6, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bush* in view of "IIOP: Internet Inter-ORB Protocol" by Ramesh Panuganty, hereinafter *Panauganty*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bush*. As amended, Claim 1 recites:

1. (Amended) A framework for a network management device, comprising:
 - an object repository having a set of at least one object class definition, each object class definition containing information needed to retrieve instances of an object defined by the corresponding object class definition and configured to maintain data regarding at least one managed device on a network;
 - an object manager configured to retrieve at least one object class definition from the object repository and initiate at least one class function of the retrieved objects to retrieve at least one class instance; and
 - an interface configured to retrieve data from the class instances and forward it to a user of the network management device;
- wherein said object repository is configured to accept provider plug-in modules configured to hold at least one of said object class definitions;
- the object manager is further configured to scan a provider list and recognize objects needed to fulfill data requests regarding remote network devices from a remote front end device; and
- the object manager is yet further configured to utilize multiple objects recognized from different provider lists and the interface to retrieve data to fulfill the data requests.

However, *Bush* fails to teach or suggest similar subject matter. In particular, Applicants respectfully note that Claim 1 specifically recites that the object manager is further configured to "*scan a provider list and recognize objects needed to fulfill data requests regarding remote network device.*"

Applicants admit that Bush provides the ability to utilize plug-in object repositories to retrieve information related to managed network devices. However, Busch's retrieval is limited to the retrieval of specific objects or information that are part of planned scheme of management clients that monitor specific managed machines (for example, see Bush, col. 4, lines 41-55, and Fig. 2, which describe management clients 60 and 62 that monitor machines 64, 66, and 68).

In contrast, Applicants claimed invention provides an object manager that scans a provider list and is capable of recognizing objects needed to fulfill data requests from a remote front end. Thus, the claimed invention provides a flexible scanning and recognition scheme to decide which objects to utilize to retrieve data needed to fulfill a request.

Applicants respectfully traverse any assertion that would equate Bush's use of objects to manage objects to Applicants claimed scanning and recognition of objects for retrieving data to fulfill data requests. In fact, Bush's use of the plug-ins and associated objects is to retrieve the objects when a specific client request is made. The request is made, and the corresponding object is invoked (e.g., see Bush, col. 5, lines 30-36, which describe MMC invocation of snap-ins to provide their corresponding management behavior). However, although the claimed invention does invoke certain objects or routines within those objects to collect data, the claimed invention scans and recognizes if the management resources (in the form of objects) are available to fulfill the request. Thus the claimed invention is not tied to a request and corresponding object. In fact, the claimed invention, it is the object manager that decides (through scanning and recognition) which objects to utilize to find the requested data.

Further, the claimed invention utilizes an interface to return data retrieved from the class instances needed to respond to the data request. In contrast, Bush returns a uniformly rendered managed object (e.g., col. 5, lines 66 and 67). Again, such an arrangement makes Bush tied to a specific arrangement of the object returned, while the present invention returns data that is potentially retrieved across "*multiple objects recognized from different provider lists ...*"

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 can not be anticipated or considered obvious in view of Bush, because Bush fails to teach or suggest subject matter specifically claimed in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Bush.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bush. As amended, Claim 15 recites:

15. (Amended) A ~~method of retrieving network management information,~~ comprising the steps of:

receiving, at an object manager in a backend receiver, a data request related to network management information from a remotely located front end;

scanning a provider list;

recognizing a set of objects in the provider list needed to retrieve and reference the requested data;

determining a set of information needed for network management if the recognized set of objects have been instantiated at the backend receiver;

loading at least one object the set of objects, at least one having a class hierarchy and class routines capable of retrieving and maintaining the needed network management requested data, into an the object manager;

invoking class routines for retrieving an instance instances of the object set of objects;

retrieving the requested data from the object instances; and

forwarding the needed management requested data to a user the remotely located front end.

However, Bush fails to teach or suggest similar subject matter. In particular, Applicants respectfully note the steps of “*scanning a provider list,*” and “*forwarding only the requested data retrieved from the object instances to the remotely located front end.*” In contrast, as noted in the discussions above, Bush fails to teach or suggest similar subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is also patentable over Bush.

Based on the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 15, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 5-8, 16, 17, and 19-33 are also patentable. In addition, Applicants respectfully note that new Claims 23-33 provide further patentable distinction over Bush and the other cited references.

Consequently, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and it is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Dated: December 6, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

REED SMITH LLP

Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 2000
P.O. Box 7936
San Francisco, CA 94120-7936
Direct Dial: (415) 659-5927
Facsimile: (415) 391-8269

By: 

Name: John W. Carpenter

Reg. No. 39,129

DOCSSFO-12386012.1-JCARPENTER